



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,151	07/16/2003	Sathyanarayanan N. Kavacheri	SUN-P030092	1922
33615 7590 03/03/2008 OSHA LIANG I.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010				
EXAMINER PYO, MONICA M				
ART UNIT 2161		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/03/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lord@oshaliang.com
hernandez@oshaliang.com
DOCKETING@OSHALIANG.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/622,151

Applicant(s)

KAVACHERI ET AL.

Examiner

MONICA M. PYO

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 15-18 and 21-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 15-18 and 21-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 12/13/2007.
2. Claims 1-4, 7, 15-18 and 21-29 are currently pending in this application. In the Amendment filed 12/13/2007, claims 24-29 are newly added. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 15, 17-18, 21-22, 24-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0105778 by Andani (hereinafter Andani) in view of U.S. Patent No. 2004/0230899 by Pagnano et al. (hereinafter pagnano).

Regarding Claims 1, 15 and 24, Andani discloses a method of retrieving device-dependent attributes stored on a portal server, said method comprising:

A). establishing communication, with a device, as a connection between a device and a network (Andani: pg. 2, [0016]; pg. 3, [0035]);

B). receiving a request from said device after establishing communication, as a control pointer being added to the network (Andani: pg. 2, [0016-0017]);

C). identifying a type of said device in response to receiving said request, as the control point to search for devices after the control pointer is added to the network [the request initiated by the added control pointer of a device] (Andani: pg. 2, [0014 & 0016-0017]);

D). identifying a characteristic of said type of device in response to receiving said request, wherein said type is a subset of said characteristic, as the installed control pointer retrieves the device's DDF for more information about the device (Andani: pg. 2, [0016-0017, 0018]); and

E). retrieving an entry from a list of attributes in response to receiving said request, wherein the list of attributes (i.e., a Device Description File [DDF] or a Service Description Files [SDF]) with said device, said entry selected first according to said type of device and second according to said characteristic when said list does not include said entry that corresponds to said type of device, as each device developers are required to implement either DDF or SDFs for each device; a list of variables describing per device type, range, and event characteristics (Andani: pg. 1, [0006-0007]; pg. 2, [0016, 0020-0021]); and

F). responding to said request with said entry, wherein said entry is presented to said device for use, as the control point sends an action request to services provided by the selected device and a sample of DDF (Andani: pg. 2, [0022-0023]).

Although Andani inherently teaches the claim limitation of “wherein the list of attributes is available to the portal server prior to the establishing communication with said device [i.e., device developers are required to individually implement two types of XML files for each device]” (Andani: pg. 2, [0016-0017]), Andani does not explicitly disclose the limitation where the list of attributes is available to the portal server prior to the established communication.

However, Pagnano discloses:

A). by the portal server, as the web service (Pagnano: pg. 2, [0010]);

E). wherein the list of attributes (i.e., Device Description Language source files describing core parameters that are characteristics of the device) **is available to the portal server** (i.e., web service) **prior to establishing communication with said device**, as different DDL source files may be associated with various types of the smart field devices (Pagnano: pg. 1, [0003]; pg. 2, [0010]).

It would have been obvious to person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Andani with the teachings of Pagnano to utilize the Device Description Language source file written by developers with the motivation to enhance the converting method of reading a Device Description file (Pagnano: pg. 1, [0005-0006]).

Regarding Claims 3 and 17, Andani and Pagnano disclose the method wherein said type of device is identifiable by a brand name and a model number (Andani: pg. 2, [0018-0019]).

Regarding Claims 4 and 18, Andani and Pagnano disclose the method wherein said characteristic is identifiable by a type of markup language used by said type of device (Andani: pg. 1, [0003 & 0020]).

Regarding Claims 7 and 21, Andani and Pagnano disclose the method wherein said list of attributes further comprises entries that are independent of device type and device characteristic (Andani: pg. 2, [0021]).

Regarding Claim 22, Andani and Pagnano discloses the computer-readable medium wherein said first attribute corresponds to said device communicating with said portal server system (Andani: pg. 2, [0020-0021]; pg. 3, [0035]).

Regarding claim 25, Andani and Pagnano disclose the method further comprising:

Creating a new category in said list associated with said type, wherein the attribute is stored into the new category (Andani: pg.2, [0022]; pg. 3, [0027-0028]).

Regarding claim 27, Andani and Pagnano disclose the method wherein said type of device is identified by a brand name and a model number (Andani: pg. 2, [0018-0019]).

Regarding claim 28, Andani and Pagnano disclose the method wherein said list of attributes is sorted by device type (Andani: pg. 3, [0025]).

Regarding claim 29, Andani and Pagnano disclose the method wherein said list of attributes further comprises a category for attributes independent of device type (Andani: pg. 2, [0021]).

5. Claims 2, 16, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andani in view of Pagnano as applied to claims 1, 3-4, 7, 15, 17-18, 21-22, 24-25 and 27-29 above, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,814 issued to Britton (hereinafter Britton).

Regarding Claims 2 and 16, Andani and Pagnano do not explicitly disclose the method wherein said communication is wireless.

However, Britton discloses: the method wherein said communication is wireless (Britton: col. 7, Ins. 48-56; col. 8, Ins. 26-38).

It would have been obvious to person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teaching of Andani and Pagnano with the teachings of Britton to utilize the wireless communication with the motivation to enhance data processing system (Britton: col. 3, Ins. 18-28).

Regarding Claim 26, Andani and Pagnano disclose the method wherein said portal server is a portal server operable to client devices (Andani: pg. 2, [0020-0021]; pg. 3, [0035]) and (Pagnano: pg. 2, [0010]).

However, Britton discloses: the method wherein said communication wirelessly with client device (Britton: col. 7, Ins. 48-56; col. 8, Ins. 26-38).

It would have been obvious to person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teaching of Andani and Pagnano with the teachings of Britton to utilize the wireless communication with the motivation to enhance data processing system (Britton: col. 3, Ins. 18-28).

Regarding Claim 23, Andani and Pagnano do not explicitly disclose the computer-readable medium wherein said first attribute corresponds to another device different from said

device communicating with said portal server system, said other device identified during said communicating.

However, Britton discloses the computer-readable medium wherein said first attribute corresponds to another device different from said device communicating with said portal server system, said other device identified during said communicating (Britton: col. 4, lns. 21-39; col. 9, lns. 29-46).

It would have been obvious to person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teaching of Andani and Pagnano with the teachings of Britton to utilize logging on PDA from a desktop workstation with the motivation to enhance data processing system (Britton: col. 3, lns. 18-28).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 7, 15-18, and 21-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONICA M. PYO whose telephone number is (571)272-8192. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon & Thur 7:00 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Monica M Pyo
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

mpyo
2/25/2008

/Apu M Mofiz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161